



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,602	06/22/2001	Frederic Bauchot	FR920000050US1	7284

7590 09/01/2005

IBM CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT. IQOA/BLDG. 040-3  
1701 NORTH STREET  
ENDICOTT,, NY 13760

EXAMINER
----------

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/887,602

**Applicant(s)**

BAUCHOT, FREDERIC

**Examiner**

CESAR B. PAULA

**Art Unit**

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the RCE amendment filed on 6/17/2005.

**This action is made Non-Final.**

2. In the amendment, claims 1-12 are pending in the case. Claims 1, and 12 are independent claims.

#### ***Priority***

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), and based on application # 480096.7 filed with the EPO on 10/24/2000, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

#### ***Drawings***

4. The drawings filed on 6/22/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, and 12 recite "*different addresses relative to cell A1 of the respective*

Art Unit: 2178

page” in lines 9-10, and 10-11 respectively. The term “A1” is vague, since it connotes multiple meanings. The term does not clearly establish what it is attempting to describe (i.e., location of a cell), because it is based on a variable convention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al, hereinafter Anderson (Pat.# 5,463,724, 10/31/1995), in view of Barnes, “10 Minute Guide to Windows 3.1”, Alpha, 1992, pp.60-64.

Regarding independent claim 1, Anderson discloses the grouping of cells in a page of a multidimensional spreadsheet—*defining a set ranges of cells*—for changing the information or content of the different groupings of cells simultaneously. Information is placed in one group of cells, and then this information is automatically percolated or replicated to the other group of cells in the page. The cells have content, such as “Loan amount, %”, etc. The groups of cells have different addresses relative to the first cell (A1) of the respective page where the cell groups are found—*at least two of said ranges having different addresses relative to cell A1 of the respective page on which each of said ranges are located* (col.10, lines 58-col.11, line 30, and

Art Unit: 2178

col.7, lines 62-col.8, line 10, fig. 4G-4J). Therefore, by changing the content in one cell of the group the content of the whole group is also changed.

Moreover, Anderson discloses the automatic percolating or replicating of information changes made in one block of cells in one page to a version of the same block of cells in other locations—*automatically performing a self-replication operation* (col.11, lines 4-30, fig. 4H-J). In other words, once the block of cells have been modified, this modification is passed to every cell in the other group—*determining the set of ranges to which the changed range of cells belongs to, and identifying the ranges or pages of cells belonging to said set* or grouping

Moreover, Anderson fails to explicitly disclose: *copying the changed range of cells onto a buffer, and pasting the content of the buffer in each of the identified range of cells belonging to said set*. However, Barnes teaches the copying of information into a clipboard--*buffer*. This information is then pasted from the clipboard into a specified location (page 60, lines 14-20). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anderson, and Barnes and copy the block of cells into the clipboard, because Barnes teaches above the copying of information from an original location to a second location without disturbing the original information, which provides the benefit of saving the time needed to manually inputting the same information several times.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Anderson discloses creating groups of spreadsheet pages, and including the same page in more than one group—*adding a new range of cells to said ranges of cells* (col.9, lines 60-67, col. 10, lines 1-31).

Art Unit: 2178

In addition, Anderson discloses the entering of data in a spreadsheet page cell located in one group, and ending the entry with a “CTRL-Enter” command—*selecting a new range of cells*--. The entry of the command causes the propagation of entered data to other group of pages—*creating a link between the new range of cells with at least one range of cells with at least one range of cells belonging to said set of ranges of cells* (col. 10, lines 18-31).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Anderson discloses the automatic percolating or replicating of changes made in one block of cells in one page to a version of the same block of cells in other pages—*performing a persistent (not temporary) copy operation* (col.10, lines 16-31). In other words, once the block of cells have been modified, this modification is passed to every page in the group—*selecting a first range of cells*.

In addition, Anderson discloses the entering of data in a spreadsheet page cell located in one group, and ending the entry with a “CTRL-Enter” command. The entry of the command causes the propagation of entered data to other group of pages—*creating a link between each other range of cells and the first range of cells* (col. 10, lines 18-31).

Furthermore, Anderson fails to explicitly disclose: *copying onto a buffer the selected first range of cells, and persistent pasting the content onto each other selected range of cells*.

However, Barnes teaches the copying of information into a clipboard--*buffer*. This information is then pasted from the clipboard into a specified location (page 60, lines 14-20). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anderson, and Barnes and copy the block of cells into the clipboard, because Barnes teaches above the copying of information from an original location to a second location without

Art Unit: 2178

disturbing the original information, which provides the benefit of saving the time needed to manually inputting the same information several times.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 3, Anderson discloses the automatic percolating or replicating of changes made in one block of cells in one page to a version of the same block of cells in other pages—*invoking a persistent (not temporary) copy and paste command operation* (col.10, lines 16-31). In other words, once the block of cells have been modified, this modification is copied and pasted to every page in the group.

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Anderson discloses the storing in a spreadsheet(s) of marks for identifying a spreadsheet page(s), such as A1 to C4—*table name--* of page A, which are used for addressing block of cells in a spreadsheet page—*creating a link in said table between the name of the set and said means for identifying each range of cells* (col.10, lines 16-31, and fig.2C).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Anderson discloses the annotation of spreadsheet groups—*associating the ranges of cells with set dependent display attributes*, such as annotations (col.10, lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 5, Anderson discloses the automatic percolating or replicating of changes made in one block of cells in one page to a version of the same block of cells in other pages. A user inputs selects, and inputs data into a cell, such as

Art Unit: 2178

“Large Ceaser Food cost” (fig.4G, B4)—*set dependent value*, which depends on information in this page, in a spreadsheet page. Once data entry is completed, the data is copied a pasted to other pages which were grouped with the entry page in this group—*associating a first variable with said set of ranges of cells* or pages in the group — (col.10, lines 1-31).

Furthermore, Anderson teaches the display of notebook pages according with certain settable display properties—*displaying the ranges with display attributes according to the value of said first variable* (col.14, lines 1-67)

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 4, Anderson discloses using an inspector for determining the various properties of a page or block of cells—*determining current attributes of said range of cells* (col.13, line 45-col.14, line67).

Moreover, Anderson teaches the setting, and changing of page, and block of cells properties changing the display format of the page or block of cells, which are stored in the page or table—*storing in said table said current attributes and associating in said table the range of cells with current attributes* (col.13, line 45-col.14, line67, fig.8A).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 7, Anderson discloses the automatic percolating or replicating of changes made in one block of cells in one page to a version of the same block of cells in other pages. A user inputs selects, and inputs data into a cell, such as “Tossed Food cost” (fig.4G, B4)—*second variable with each range of cells and setting said second variable to a value associated with said current attributes* of the pages they are displayed on, in a spreadsheet page — (col.10, lines 1-31).



Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 7, Anderson discloses the cutting or deleting of blocks of cells, and displaying the edited spreadsheet —*removing a range of cells, retrieving the current attributes, and displaying said current display attributes*— (col.10, lines 58-col.11, line20, fig.4G-I).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 5, Anderson discloses the storing in a spreadsheet(s) of marks for identifying a spreadsheet page(s), such as A1 to C4—*table name--* of page A, which are used for addressing block of cells in a spreadsheet page—*creating a link in said table between the name of the set and said means for identifying each range of cells* (col.10, lines 16-31, and fig.2C). In other words the identification makes use of the addresses of the cell blocks.

Claim 12 is directed towards a software method equivalent to the steps of claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 6/17/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claims 1, and 12 the Applicant remarks that that the claims should be allowable based on the amendment that “clearly specify which page the addresses of the ranges are referring or relative to” (page 8). The Examiner disagrees, because Anderson discloses the grouping of cells in a page of a multidimensional spreadsheet—*defining a set ranges of cells*—

Art Unit: 2178

for changing the information or content of the different groupings of cells simultaneously.

Information is placed in one group of cells, and then this information is automatically percolated or replicated to the other group of cells in the page. The cells have content, such as “Loan amount, %”, etc. These groups of cells have different addresses relative to the first cell (A1) of the respective page where the cell groups are found—at least two of said ranges having different addresses relative to cell A1 of the respective page on which each of said ranges are located (col.10, lines 58-col.11, line 30, and col.7, lines 62-col.8, line 10, fig. 4G-4J).

### ***Conclusion***

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about

Art Unit: 2178

access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866  
217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)



**CESAR PAULA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

8/19/05